KD

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,593	01/25/2002	Ralf Geiben Lynn	23659-502	2936

7590 05/12/2004

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
PARKIN, JEFFREY S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1648	

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,593	LYNN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4-17* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *Notice to Comply ....*.

Detailed Office Action

Status of the Claims

Applicants' election of Group I (claims 1-3) without traverse in the response dated 31 December, 2003, is acknowledged. Claims 4-17 are are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821-1.825

This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821-1.825. Applicants' attention is directed to the final rulemaking notice published at 55 F.R. 18230 (01 May, 1990) and 1114 O.G. 29 (15 May, 1990). Since the effective filing date is on or after 08 September, 2000, applicants are directed toward the final rulemaking notice published in the Federal Register at 65 F.R. 54604 (08 September, 2000) and 1238 O.G. 145 (19 September, 2000). **Applicants must provide an initial computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing", an initial paper copy or compact disk copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as, an amendment directing its entry into the application. Applicant must also provide a statement that the content of the sequence listing information recorded in the computer readable form is identical to the written (on paper or compact disc) sequence listing** and, where applicable, includes no new matter as required by 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821(e), 1.821(f), 1.821(g), 1.825(b), and 1.825(d). If applicant desires the sequence listing in the instant application to be identical with that of another application on file in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, such request in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.821(e) may be submitted in lieu of a new CRF.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. *In re Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 U.S.P.Q. 323 (C.C.P.A. 1981). *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 U.S.P.Q. 90 (C.C.P.A. 1976). *In re Rochester*, 358 F.3d 916, 69 U.S.P.Q.2d 1886 (C.A.F.C. 2004). The claims are broadly directed toward a method of treating HIV-1 infection through the administration of a peroxiredoxin. Perusal of the disclosure reveals that "the term "peroxiredoxin" encompasses **allelic variants, species variants**, and conservative **amino acid substitution variants.** The term also encompasses ... peroxiredoxin **fragments**" (pp. 10-11, bridging paragraph). It also states that the "term "peroxiredoxin" also encompasses **variants** and functional **analogs** of peroxiredoxins having a homologous amino acid sequence with a peroxiredoxin. The present invention thus includes pharmaceutical formulations comprising such peroxiredoxin variants and functional analogs, carrying modifications like **substitutions, deletions, insertions, inversions** or **cyclisations**" (p. 11, first paragraph). Thus, a reasonable interpretation of the claim language, based upon the definitions set forth in the specification, would encompass all of these species.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient

detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc., v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1116. The issue raised in this application is whether the original application provides adequate support for the broadly claimed genus of variant peroxiredoxins. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described where an invention is described solely in terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship between the structure of the invention and its function. A biomolecule sequence described only by functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the biomolecule of interest. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1993). *In re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1210 (Fed. Cir. 1995). A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The court noted in this decision that a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not reasonably lead those skilled in the art to any particular species.

An applicant may show possession of an invention by disclosure

of drawings or structural chemical formulas that are sufficiently detailed to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention as a whole. An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. For some biomolecules, examples of identifying characteristics include a nucleotide or amino acid sequence, chemical structure, binding affinity, binding specificity, and molecular weight. The written description requirement may be satisfied through disclosure of function and minimal structure when there is a well-established correlation between structure and function. Without such a correlation, the capability to recognize or understand the structure form the mere recitation of function and minimal structure is highly unlikely. In the latter case, disclosure of function alone is little more than a wish for possession; it does not satisfy the written description requirement. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 U.S.P.Q.2d 1398, 1404, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 U.S.P.Q. 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Factors to be considered in determining whether there is sufficient evidence of possession include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention.

As previously set forth, the claims of the instant application are broadly directed toward variant peroxiredoxins. The term peroxiredoxin can encompass **allelic variants, species variants,**

conservative **amino acid substitution variants, fragments, substitutions, deletions, insertions, inversions** or **cyclisations.** The peroxiredoxin family encompasses a large and diverse number of sundry proteins (e.g., Prx I-VI) with disparate chemical structures and activities. The disclosure details the identification of two specific peroxiredoxins, NKEF-A and -B, with putative antiviral activities. The disclosure does not describe the activities of any other peroxiredoxin species. The disclosure does not describe the preparation and characterization of any peroxiredoxin variants, or fragments thereof, that can reasonably be expected to retain the antiviral activity of the parent compounds. The disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the molecular determinants modulating the antiviral activity of any given peroxiredoxin. Thus, the skilled artisan has been asked to guess as to which of the inordinate number of variants might be useful as antivirals in the treatment of HIV-1 infection.

Applicants are reminded that the courts have concluded that generalized language may not suffice as a patent description if it does not convey the detailed identity of an invention. A description of what a material does, rather than of what it is, usually does not suffice. *Regents of the Univ. of Cal.* v. *Eli Lilly & Co., Inc.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568 (43 U.S.P.Q.2d 1398) (Fed. Cir. 1997). The disclosure must allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter purportedly described. As the Supreme Court has cautioned, **"a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion."** *Brenner* v. *Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 536 (148 U.S.P.Q. 689) (1966). Here, the applicants have only identified two species that display *in vitro* antiviral activity. However, they are attempting to capture subject matter in an area where they have clearly failed to perform sufficient experimental work. Accordingly, the skilled artisan would reasonably conclude that applicants fail to meet the

requirements set forth under this statute.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As set forth *supra*, the claims are directed toward methods of treating HIV-1 infection through the administration of a peroxiredoxin. The term peroxiredoxin can encompass **allelic variants, species variants**, conservative **amino acid substitution variants, fragments, substitutions, deletions, insertions, inversions** or **cyclisations.** The peroxiredoxin family encompasses a large and diverse number of sundry proteins (e.g., Prx I-VI) with disparate chemical structures and activities. The disclosure details the identification of two specific peroxiredoxins, NKEF-A and -B, with putative antiviral activities.

The disclosure describes the analysis of gene expression profiles of activated $CD8^+$ T-cells using a human cDNA expression array. It was observed that natural killer cell enhancing factors (NKEF) -A and -B were up-regulated in HIV-1-infected patients as compared to seronegative patients. The specification further reported that rNKEF-A and -B inhibited HIV-1 replication in an *in vitro* tissue culture assay. T-cell transfection studies revealed that T-cells transfected with NKEF-A or -B were able to inhibit HIV-1 replication. Finally, elevated levels of NKEF-A and -B were observed in 23% of a small pane of HIV-1-infected, but untreated patients, who were long-term nonprogressors.

The legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation have been clearly set forth. *Enzo Biochem, Inc.*, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (C.A.F.C. 1999). *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988). *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded that several factual inquiries should be considered when making

such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows:

1) The disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the molecular determinants modulating the antiviral activities of any given peroxiredoxin. In order to fully appreciate and understand the invention, the skilled artisan would require a knowledge of those regions of any given peroxiredoxin that are *sine qua non* for the inhibitory activities of the protein. However, the disclosure fails to describe any mapping or mutagenesis studies to identify such regions. The disclosure fails to demonstrate that this critical molecular determinants are present in other peroxiredoxin species.

2) The disclosure fails to reasonably suggest which peroxiredoxin allelic variants, species variants, conservative amino acid substitution variants, fragments, substitutions, deletions, insertions, inversions or cyclisations will display the requisite antiviral activity required for the treatment of HIV-1 infection. As discussed above, the peroxiredoxin family consists of a large number of genetically unrelated proteins. The disclosure fails to identify those portions of NKEF-A and -B that are required for antiviral activity and if these regions are present in other peroxiredoxin members. The disclosure fails to detail the preparation of a single variant with the desired activity. Thus, the skilled artisan has been asked to guess as to which members of the family, and variants thereof, that can reasonably be expected to function in the manner desired.

3) The claims are broadly directed toward a large genus of compounds that includes peroxiredoxin allelic variants, species variants, conservative amino acid substitution variants, fragments, substitutions, deletions, insertions, inversions or cyclisations. However, the disclosure fails to provide sufficient guidance pertaining to the structural regions modulating the antiviral actvities of the peroxiredoxins, which members of the family share these regions, and which portions of the protein can be modified in such a manner as to provide therapeutic activities.

4) The disclosure fails to provide any working embodiments. While it was noted that NKEF-A and -B displayed *in vitro* inhibitory activities, such simple tissue culture models are not generally considered to be predictive of clinical efficacy. It was reported that NKEF-A and -B were elevated in approximately 23% of a patient population that was not undergoing standard antiviral therapy. This finding is also hardly predictive of clinical success. First, the majority of patients failed to have elevated levels. Second, the patients appear to be long-term nonprogressors and are likely to be infected with an effete virus. Third, the fact that NKEF levels are elevated, does not demonstrate that this is responsible for the control of viral replication. The patients examined may simply have a robust immune response and humoral or cell-mediated components may be responsible for the lack of disease progression.

5) The state-of-the-art vis-à-vis HIV-1 antiviral development is one of unpredictability. Many promising antiviral agents have failed in the clinic because of several factors including the failure to adequately ascertain the pharmacological profile of any given compound beforehand, the quasispecies nature of HIV infection which leads to drug-resistance, the large quantities of virus present in the hematopoietic and lymphatic compartments, and the lack of adequate animal models with which to assess antiviral effectiveness (Gait and Karn, 1995; Yarchoan *et al.*, 1993; Back, 1999; Patience et al., 1994). The disclosure fails to address any

of these caveats.

Accordingly, when all the aforementioned factors are considered *in toto*, it would clearly require undue experimentation to practice the claimed invention.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0908. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, Laurie Scheiner or James Housel, can be reached at (571) 272-0910 or (571) 272-0902, respectively. Direct general inquiries to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist at (571) 272-1600.

Formal communications may be submitted through the official facsimile number which is (703) 872-9306. Hand-carried formal communications should be directed toward the customer window located in Crystal Plaza Two, 2011 South Clark Place, Arlington, VA. Applicants are directed toward the O.G. Notice for further guidance. 1280 O.G. 681. Informal communications may be submitted to the Examiner's RightFAX account at (571) 273-0908.

Respectfully,

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1648

10 May, 2004

10/057,593

Application No.: 10/057,593

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.

☒ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).

☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).

☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."

☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).

☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable from of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).

☐ 7. Other: _____

Applicant Must Provide:

☒ An initial ~~or substitute~~ computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".

☒ An initial ~~or substitute~~ paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.

☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216
For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212
For PatentIn software help, call (703) 308-6856

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE